



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,165	10/22/2001	Terence Edward Sumner	47260-00007USPT	9446

7590 01/16/2004

Stanley R. Moore, Esq.
Jenkins & Gilchrist, P.C.
Suite 3200
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75202-2799

EXAMINER

PATEL, AJIT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2664

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/040,165

Applicant(s)

SUMNER ET AL.

Examiner

AJIT G. PATEL

Art Unit

2664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-21 and 23-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-21 and 23-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2664

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6,8,10,11,13-16,18,20,21,23-26,28,30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over H. Kuki (EP O 772,327) of the record in view of Gabber et al (6,574,658, newly cited).

Regarding claims 1, 11 and 21, Kuki discloses an electric mail forwarding system incorporating the steps of receiving, at the wireless messaging engine, , a communication message from a first communication network, the communication message including address information associated with a subscriber (210 of fig. 3); storing, by the wireless messaging engine, the communication message, the communication message being stored in association with the subscriber (204 of fig. 3); and selectively sending, with the wireless messaging engine using a second communication network, at least a portion of the filtered communication message to a wireless device (208,300, 100 of fig. 3). Kuki fails to disclose the filter which filter out unnecessary information from the communication message. Gabber et al disclose a communication system which discloses the filter which filter out unnecessary information from the communication message (lines 40-43, col. 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the filter as

Art Unit: 2664

taught by Gabber et al in the system of Kuki for filtering out unnecessary information from the communication message to prevent the system from congestion.

Regarding claim 2, Kuki discloses the step of “selectively sending, with the wireless messaging engine using the second communication network, at least a portion of the communication message to a first communication device” (210,400 of fig. 3).

Regarding claims 3, 13, 23, Kuki discloses the step of “storing by the wireless messaging engine, preference information in association with the subscriber” (lines 25-49, col. 14).

Regarding claims 4, 14, 24, Kuki discloses the step of “formatting, at a processing proxy, the communication message before the step of selectively sending the at least a portion of the communication message to the wireless device” (lines 11-21, col. 13).

× Regarding claims 5, 15, 25, Kuki discloses the step of “establishing session information in association with a communication session, the session information providing threading and state information for session participant messages” (lines 39-58, col, 10).

Regarding claims 6, 16,26, Kuki discloses the step of “the receiving step further includes validating a subscriber to which the communication message is addressed against stored subscriber validated information” (col. 16, line 53- line 10, col. 17).

Regarding claims 8, 18,28, Kuki discloses the step of “the selectively sending step further includes routing the at least a portion of the communication message in accordance with stored location information, the stored location information indicating a location of the wireless device within the second communication network” (lines 43-49, col. 4).

Art Unit: 2664

Regarding claims 10,20, 30, Kuki discloses the limitation “wherein the at least a portion of the communication message is determined in accordance with stored subscriber preference” (lines 25-34, col. 14).

3. Claims 7, 17, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over H. Kuki and Gabber et al as applied to claims 1-6,8,10-16,18,20-26,28,30 above, and further in view of Belpaire.

Kuki and Gabber et al disclose all the claimed subject as described in previous paragraph except the step of formatting the at least a portion of the communication message in accordance with at least one of wireless device capabilities, and stored preference information associated with the subscriber. A. Belpaire discloses a method and apparatus for electronic mail transmission as short messages towards a mobile radio terminal incorporating the step of formatting the at least a portion of the communication message in accordance with at least one of wireless device capabilities, and stored preference information associated with the subscriber (col. 5, line 52- col. 8, line 8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the step of formatting the at least a portion of the communication message in accordance with at least one of wireless device capabilities, and stored preference information associated with the subscriber as taught by A. Belpaire in the system of Kuki and Gabber et al in order to make the mail service gateway’s working and functionality transparent.

Art Unit: 2664

4. Claims 9,19,29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over H. Kuki and Gabber et al as applied to claims 1-6,8,10-16,18,20-26,28,30 above, and further in view of J. Miller.

Kuki and Gabber et al discloses all the subject matter as described in previous paragraph except of authenticating an originator of the communication message. J. Miller discloses secure web-based mail and authentication system incorporating the step of authenticating an originator of the communication message (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the step of authenticating an originator of the communication as taught by J. Miller in the system of Kuki and Gabber et al in order to make the system more secure.

5. Claims 1,4,6,11,14,16,21,24,26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syed et al in view of Gabber et al.

Regarding claims 1,4,6,11,14,16,21,24,26, Syed et al disclose a selective call receiver incorporating the steps of receiving, at the wireless messaging engine, a communication message from a first communication network, the communication message including address information associated with a subscriber (page 6, line 30-page 7, line 33); storing, by the wireless messaging engine, the communication message, the communication message being stored in association with the subscriber (page 6, line 30-page 7, line 33); and selectively sending, with the wireless messaging engine using a second communication network, at least a portion of the communication message to a wireless device (page 6, line 30-page 7, line 33). Syed et al fail to disclose the filter which filter out unnecessary information from the communication message. Gabber et al disclose a

Art Unit: 2664

communication system which discloses the filter which filter out unnecessary information from the communication message (lines 40-43, col. 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the filter as taught by Gabber et al in the system of Syed et al for filtering out unnecessary information from the communication message to prevent the system from congestion.

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11,13-21,23-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CAR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CAR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2664


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AJIT PATEL whose telephone number is (703) 308-5347. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WELLINGTON CHIN can be reached on (703) 305-4366. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377 .

AJIT PATEL

January 10, 2004


AJIT PATEL
Pri. Examiner